UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,985	01/19/2001	Michael A. Sharp	65-1	1204
MICHAEL SHA	7590 07/10/200 <b>ARP</b>	EXAMINER		
POBOX 101	17265		MYHRE, JAMES W	
PORTER, TX 77365			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3688	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/765,985	SHARP, MICHAEL A.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JAMES W. MYHRE	3688	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<del></del>	out prior to the data of filing a brick	مطالم مسلم مسلم مسلم النبيد	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	coresponding number of finding reje	oted ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>06/27/08</u>	<u>3</u>	
	/Ja Supervisory Patent Exar	ames W Myhre/ miner, Art Unit 3688	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments are non-persuasive. The Applicant argues against the Official Notice that any incoming data file can be locally stored by stating that "at least some streaming media servers and players were designed to ensure that 'users can only stream data and are prevented from downloading the file directly to their hard drive". However, the Official Notice is not that all receiving DEVICES can store the incoming data, but that all incoming DATA can be stored. This is true even if the incoming data has been encoded or altered. It can still be stored, but it may not be able to be played until it has been properly decoded. As per the argument that "encryption to prevent copying does not rise to the level of a suggestion that such copying could occur in the absence of such precautions", based on the discussion in Wolfe that the encryption can prevent users from being able to copy and disseminate the files it is abundantly clear that Wolfe envisions users attempting to copy the data files. Furthermore, the Applicant's exemplary argument in reference to razor wire around Alcatraz not suggesting that inmates could escape is not persuasive either. If there was no possibility of escape, then no razor wire (or any other security measure) would be needed. For example, Australia was initially used as a penal colony by Britain. However, since the likelihood of an inmate "escaping" from Australia was not considered plausible, no razor wire (or other fencing) was used. The remote location was considered enough of a deterrent.